



1Fr 2145
PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
(MBHB Case No. 03-509-A)

In the Application of:)
)
Matichuk)
)
Serial No. 09/972,424)
)
Filed: Oct. 4, 2001)
)
For: One Click Web Records)

Conf. No.: 8244
Group Art Unit: 2145
Examiner: Choudhury, A.

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:


TRANSMITTAL LETTER

In regard to the above identified application:

1. We are transmitting herewith the attached:
 - a. Interview Record Regarding Office Action Mailed January 3, 2005;
 - b. Return Receipt Postcard.
2. With respect to additional fees:

☒ No fee is due at this time.
3. Please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No.13-2490. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.
4. CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR § 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this Transmittal Letter and the paper, as described in paragraph 1 hereinabove, are being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: July 5, 2005

Respectfully submitted,
By: 
Jeffrey A. Steck
Reg. No. 40,184

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 913-0001
Facsimile: (312) 913-0002



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

(MBHB Case No. 03-509-A)

In the Application of:)	
)	Conf. No.: 8244
Matichuk)	
)	Group Art Unit: 2145
Serial No. 09/972,424)	
)	Examiner: Choudhury, A.
Filed: Oct. 4, 2001)	
)	
For: One Click Web Records)	

INTERVIEW RECORD REGARDING OFFICE ACTION MAILED JAN 3, 2005

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On July 5, 2005, Examiner Azizul Choudhury offered the Applicant the courtesy of a telephonic interview regarding the Office Action mailed January 3, 2005. The Applicant offers this paper as a written record of the interview.

A. Subject Matter of the Interview

It appears that a Preliminary Amendment to the claims was not considered in connection with the examination of the application. On Oct. 4, 2001, together with the filing of the present application, the Applicant filed a Preliminary Amendment to

the claims entitled "Amendment A." It is evident that this Preliminary Amendment was received by the USPTO, since it is listed in the PAIR system as having been filed on Oct. 4, 2001.


The Preliminary Amendment amended several of the claims and added a new claim number 40. The Office Action of January 3, 2005, however, refers to language that does not appear in the claims as amended, and it examines only 39 of the 40 pending claims. As a result, it appears likely that the claims examined in the Office Action of January 3, 2005 are not the same as the claims currently pending in the application.

B. Substance of the Interview

On July 5, 2005, the Examiner kindly responded to the Applicant's telephonic message outlining the situation described above. The Examiner indicated that he would file an interview summary concerning today's teleconference and that he would issue a second non-final Office Action directed to the claims as amended in the October 4, 2001 Preliminary Amendment.

The Applicants thank the Examiner for his courtesy in contacting the Applicant and in working to examine the claims currently pending in the Application. If any additional issues with the application may be resolved telephonically, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's representative at (312)913-2115.

Date: July 5, 2005



Jeffrey A. Steck
Reg. No. 40,184